

REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of this application, in light of the following discussion and in view of the present amendment, is respectfully requested.

In accordance with the foregoing, the drawings and claims are amended, claims 1-7 and 14-18 are canceled without prejudice and disclaimer. Therefore, claims 8-13 remain pending for reconsideration, which is respectfully requested. No new matter is believed to have been added. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

OBJECTIONS TO THE DRAWINGS

The Office Action, at item 2, objected to FIGS. 3-6 and 10. According to the foregoing, corrected drawing replacement sheets are submitted to include the reference numbers in the drawings, and, therefore, withdrawal of the objections is respectfully requested.

OBJECTIONS TO THE CLAIMS

The Office Action, at item 3, objected to claim 6. According to the foregoing, claim 6 has been canceled, and, therefore, withdrawal of the objection is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U. S. C. §112

The Office Action, at items 4 and 5, rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U. S. C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. According to the foregoing, claims 5-7 have been canceled, and, therefore, the rejection of claim 5-7 is considered moot.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U. S. C. §101

The Office Action, at item 6, rejected claim 17 under 35 U. S. C. § 101 because the claimed invention was directed to non-statutory subject matter. According to the foregoing, claim 17 has been canceled, and, therefore, the rejection of claim 17 is considered moot.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U. S. C. §102

The Office Action, at items 7 and 8, rejected claims 1-3 and 14-18 under 35 U. S. C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Publication No. 2003/0101450 (Davidsson). Claims 1-3 and 14-18 have been canceled, and, therefore, the rejection is considered moot.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U. S. C. §103

The Office Action, at item 11, rejected claim 4 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidsson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5966685 (Flanagan).

With respect to claim 4, the rejection is considered moot, since claim 4 have been canceled.

The Office Action, at item 12, rejected claims 5-7 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidsson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6701346 (Klein).

With respect to claims 5-7, the rejection is considered moot, since claims 5-7 have been canceled.

The Office Action, at item 13, rejected claims 8 and 9 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidsson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5929927 (Rumreich).

With respect to claim 8, Davidsson is related to a multimedia apparatus in which the chat communications is multiplexed into the broadcast stream and received together with the broadcast video signal (see paragraph [0028]). The Office Action acknowledged that Davidsson fails to disclose "the streaming server sets display time per the collected text data on a basis of the number of the collected text data and the number of text data which can be displayed on a screen at a time", and relies upon Rumreich to disclose this feature.

However, it is submitted that Rumreich does not teach or suggest the above-quoted feature recited in claim 8 because Rumreich describes the following:

When two full rows of text fill the caption window (home position), the scroll function pauses and thereafter scrolls a new line of text into the window. This pause at the home position is modulated to increase or decrease its duration depending upon the buffer fullness

(See Rumreich, col.3, lines 50-55). In view of the foregoing, it is clear that Rumreich does not teach or suggest setting display time per the collected text data "on a basis of the number of the collected text data and the number of text data which can be displayed on a screen at a time". Therefore, it is submitted that claim 8 patentably distinguishes over Davidsson in view of Rumreich. Further, dependent claim 9 patentably distinguishes over Davidsson in view of Rumreich for at least the same reasons as base claim 8, from which it depends.

The Office Action, at item 14, rejected claims 10 and 11 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidsson and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2004/0218472 (Narayanaswami).

With respect to claim 10, Davidsson is related to such multimedia apparatus as described above (see paragraph [0028]). The Office Action acknowledged that Davidsson fails to disclose "the streaming server sets display time per the collected text data on a basis of the number of the collected text data and the number of text data which can be displayed on a screen at a time", and relies upon Narayanaswami to disclose this feature.

However, Claim 10 has been amended to recite "the streaming server sets the display position of at least one of the collected text data on the screen according to the meaning of the text data".

It is respectfully that Narayanaswami does not teach or suggest the above-quoted feature recited in claim 10 because Narayanaswami describes the following:

A stock whose price has increased would be represented in the normal display mode. A stock whose price is falling would be shown in reverse video. An unchanged stock price could be shown in normal display mode, or in a third color, such as gray. However, since the current display technology for wristwatches does not support color or gray-scale, a third color (to represent an unchanged stock price) would have to be simulated. One way to do this is to employ spatial dithering, as used in newspaper photos. For example, in FIG. 5 assume that the stock price for Amazon.com remains unchanged. In this example you will notice that the text for AMZN appears as gray, not black or white, as a result of dithering (see Narayanaswami, paragraph [0028]). Stated another way, Narayanaswami is merely concerned with including a third color to represent an unchanged stock price.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, it is clear that Narayanaswami does not teach or suggest "setting the display position of at least one of the collected text data on the screen according to the meaning of the text data". Thus, it is submitted that claim 10 patentably distinguishes over Davidsson in view of Narayanaswami. Further, dependent claim 11 patentably distinguishes over Davidsson in view of Narayanaswami for at least the same reasons as base claim 10, from which it depends.

The Office Action, at item 15, rejected claims 12 and 13 under 35 U. S. C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Davidsson and further in view of U.S. Publication No. 2002/0103917 (Kay).

With respect to claim 12, Davidsson is related to such multimedia apparatus as described above (see paragraph [0028]). The Office Action acknowledged that Davidsson fails to disclose "the streaming server superimposes a new text data along with at least one of the collected text data at the same time according to the meaning of one of the collected text data, the meaning of the new text data being different from one of the collected text data", and relies upon Kay to disclose this feature.

However, it is submitted that Kay does not teach or suggest the above-quoted feature in claim 12 because Kay describes the following:

A method and system for interactively responding to queries from a user sending messages through an instant messaging network. The query or request is interpreted and appropriate action is taken, such as accessing a local or remote data resource and generating an answer to the user's query. The answer is formatted as appropriate and returned to the user as an instant message or via another route specified by the user

(see Kay, Abstract). Stated another way, Kay is merely concerned with generating an answer to the user's query.

Therefore, in view of the foregoing, it is clear that Kay does not teach or suggest superimposing a new text data along with at least one of the collected text data at the same time "according to the meaning of one of the collected text data, the meaning of the new text data being different from one of the collected text data". Thus, it is submitted that claim 12 patentably distinguishes over Davidsson in view of Kay. Further, dependent claim 13 patentably distinguishes over Davidsson in view of Kay for at least the same reasons as base claim 12, from which it depends.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

SUMMARY

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/775,159

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: March 31, 2008

By: /Sheetal S. Patel/
Sheetal S. Patel
Registration No. 59,326

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501